

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Summary of the Office Action

1. The Title is objected to as being too long.
2. The Amendment of January 4, 2005 is objected as presenting new matter.
3. Claims 1-7 and 9-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.
4. Claims 1-7, 9-16, 20 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being rendered obvious over "Holt" (U.S. Patent No. 5,960,447).

Detailed Remarks

1. The Title is objected to as being too long.

The objection to the Title has been addressed.

2. The Amendment of January 4, 2005 is objected as presenting new matter.

This objection is made moot by the amendment presented. For the record, Applicant respectfully submits that Page 8, lines 10-22 provide ample support for the amendment made in the last response.

3. Claims 1-7 and 9-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

The Office Action states that the limitation added with the previous amendment requires the switching to switch between applications, and not between text mode or command mode. Applicant respectfully disagrees. In each claim, as previously or

currently amended, the switching event only takes the voice-recognition from text mode to command mode. It is from command mode that commands can be issued. As currently amended, the command mode lets commands be issued to different computers, devices, appliances and software. Support for this language can be found on page 8, lines 10-22.

4. Claims 1-7, 9-16, 20 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being rendered obvious over "Holt" (U.S. Patent No. 5,960,447).

Applicant requests reconsideration of this rejection, in view of the remarks and amendment presented.

The Office Action states: "It is noted that [Holt] does not explicitly teach that when changing the mode of operation, that the recognition should also include a command for a different application. However, [Holt] teaches that it is well known to use speech commands for a variety of applications and ...teaches that a variety of software may be combined with speech recognition to include command/control of physical systems." Applicant respectfully submits that even if this statement is assumed true, it falls short of the standard for making an obviousness type rejection. Holt does not teach or suggest command issuance to control multiple applications. It simply states that multiple applications can use voice-recognition, not switching between applications.

Regardless, the independent claims have been amended to further distinguish over the cited references. Claim 2 is representative of the amendment made to the independent claims of this application: command-mode is used to sequentially issue commands, from the computer on which the voice-recognition system executes, to any one of two or more (i) computers, (ii) appliances, (iii) devices, or (iv) applications. Support for this

Appl. No. 09/631,239
Amdt. Dated 11/17/2005
Reply to Office action of 08/04/2004

amendment is found on page 8, lines 10-22, which among other items, discusses use of different applications, computers, devices, appliances (including drivers and such).

Applicant notes that even by the teachings presented in the Office Action, Holt falls short of teaching the claimed invention. There is no teaching in Holt for issuing commands sequentially to different applications, devices, computers, or appliances.

For all of the reasons presented above, a Notice of Allowance is requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are patentable over the art of record. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is requested by Applicants. Applicants urge the Examiner to telephone Applicants' attorney at (408) 551-6632 if any issues remain that preclude allowance of the application. The Office is given permission to charge any unpaid fees to Applicants' deposit account (50-1914).

Respectfully submitted,

SHEMWELL MAHAMEDI LLP

Dated:

11/17/05


Van Mahamedi, Reg. No. 42,828

4880 Stevens Creek Blvd, Suite 201
San Jose, CA 95129
Telephone No.: (408) 551-6632
Facsimile No.: (408) 236-6641

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA. 22313-1450; or certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to the U.S. Patent Office using the centralized fax number:

BY:



11/17/05

Van Mahamedi